

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION FOUR

In re HOLLY H., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES
AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

M.H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A155510

(City & County of San Francisco
Super. Ct. No. JD173148)

M.H. (Mother) appeals the juvenile court’s findings and orders selecting a permanent plan of legal guardianship for her now 13-year-old daughter Holly and issuing a restraining order prohibiting her from having any contact with Holly. Appointed counsel filed a “No Issues Statement” pursuant to *In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835 and *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952. The statement contains a lengthy recitation of the proceedings in this matter but concludes that counsel has found no arguable issues to raise on appeal. In response to notification of her right to file a letter suggesting trial court errors for review, mother has filed a somewhat incomprehensible cover letter, accompanied by two packets of photocopied documents, which in the main are copies of documents in the record on which she has added handwritten comments. The gist of these documents is that she disputes the factual background that led to these dependency proceedings, challenges the fairness of the proceedings, and questions Holly’s safety in her placement with her older sister. Her submissions have no citations to the record or

legal authority and fail to make any legal arguments demonstrating any error or grounds for reversal. Accordingly, we shall dismiss the appeal.

Background

In prior appellate proceedings, this court has upheld the jurisdictional order finding there was substantial danger to Holly's physical health and well-being pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code¹ section 300, subdivision (b) (*In re H.H.* (May 11, 2018, A152644) [nonpub. opn.]) and the order terminating reunification services and setting a permanency planning hearing under section 366.26 (*In re H.H.* (June 1, 2018, A153930) [nonpub. opn.]). The evidence upon which these orders were based is set forth in those opinions and need not be recounted here.

In advance of the section 366.26 hearing, the court terminated visitation between mother and Holly and issued a temporary restraining order prohibiting mother from having any contact with Holly. On several occasions the court denied mother's requests for a new attorney, but ultimately granted appointed counsel's request to be relieved and a new attorney was appointed to represent mother.

Thereafter, mother filed a motion to modify the prior orders that terminated reunification services and visitation. The court denied the request on the ground that the petition failed to state new evidence or a change of circumstances.

On October 2, 2018, following a lengthy section 366.26 hearing, the court issued an order selecting a permanent plan of legal guardianship with the older sister for Holly. The court stated, "I do not believe any of the allegations with respect to Holly being unsafe with her sister. I believe that her sister is an appropriate placement, and I believe her sister will take care of her" Based on evidence that mother persisted in making unwanted disruptive appearances at Holly's school and her sister's home, in violation of the prior court orders, the court also granted the request for a three-year restraining order protecting both Holly and her sister. Mother timely filed a notice of appeal from the October 2 orders.

¹ All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

Discussion

As noted above, the materials submitted by mother fail to identify any legally cognizable error in the juvenile court's orders. Although not required to do so, we have reviewed the pertinent parts of the record, as well as mother's submission, and have found no arguable issues for briefing. (*In re Phoenix H.*, *supra*, 47 Cal.4th at pp. 841-842.) The court's adoption of a permanent plan of legal guardianship is amply supported by the record, as is the court's rejection of the allegations that Holly is not safe in her placement with her sister. Similarly, the record establishes that the permanent restraining order was properly entered based on evidence that Holly had been traumatized by her mother's conduct and repeated violations of the temporary restraining order. (*In re Cassandra B.* (2004) 125 Cal.App.4th 199, 212.) Mother's submission annotates copies of progress reports and findings contained in the record with comments such as "not true" and the like, but provides no ground for rejecting the court's findings or its most recent orders. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed. (*In re Phoenix H.*, *supra*, at pp. 843, 846; *In re Sade C.*, *supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 994.)

Disposition

The appeal is dismissed.

POLLAK, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

STREETER, J.

BROWN, J.